

HN



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/078,605 | 02/19/2002 | Michael John Branson | ROC920010345US1 | 5551 |

7590 04/07/2005

Gero G. McClellan
Moser, Patterson & Sheridan, L.L.P.
Suite 1500
3040 Post Oak Boulevard
Houston, TX 77056-6582

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

BHATIA, AJAY M

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2145

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/078,605 | Applicant(s) BRANSON ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Ajay M Bhatia | Art Unit 2145 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1, 21, 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Provinse (U.S. Patent Application 2002/0026416).

2. For claim 1, Provinse teaches, a method of maintaining a database for managing the process of a plurality of transactions through two or more applications in a business transaction environment, each application having at least one associated log file, each transaction being defined by one or more steps configured to complete the transaction, for each new log entry recorded in the at least one associated log file, the method comprising:

determining whether the new log entry comprises one of more required fields;

extracting information from the new log entry only if the new log entry comprises the one of more required fields; and

storing the information as a plurality of transaction records to a database.(see Provinse, paragraph 32)

3. For claim 21, Provinse teaches, a computer-readable medium containing a program which, when executed by a processor, performs an operation of maintaining a database for managing the process of a plurality of transactions through two or more applications in a business transaction environment, each application having at least one associated log file, each transaction being defined by one or more steps configured to complete the transaction, for each new log entry recorded in the at least one associated log file, the operation comprising:

determining whether the new log entry comprises one of more required fields;

extracting information from the new log entry only if the new log entry comprises the one of more required fields; and

storing the information as a plurality of transaction records to the database. (see Provinse, paragraph 32)

4. For claim 29, Provinse teaches, a computer, comprising:

a database maintenance program for managing the process of a plurality of transactions through two or more applications in a business transaction environment, each application having at least one associated log file, each transaction being defined by one or more steps configured to complete the transaction; and

for each new log entry recorded in the at least one associated log file, the transaction management program, when executed, performs an operation comprising:

determining whether the new log entry comprises one of more required fields;

extracting information from the new log entry only if the new log entry comprises the one of more required fields; and

storing the information as a plurality of transaction records to the database. (see Provinse, paragraph 32)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2, 10-14, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Provinse (U.S. Patent Application 2002/0026416) in view of Boothby (U.S. Patent 5,943,676).

6. For claim 2, Provinse fails to clearly disclose, the method of claim 1, further comprising receiving a notification message from the at least one associated log file indicating that the new log entry has been recorded in the at least one associated log file.

further comprising receiving a notification message from the at least one associated log file indicating that the new log entry has been recorded in the at least one associated log file. (see Boothby, Col. 12 lines 4-30, Col. 15 lines 22-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the system of Provinse of integrating entries with that of Boothby method of integrating and notifying entries since both are analogous art of integrating database entries

7. For claim 10, Provinse-Boothby teaches, the method of claim 1, wherein the one or more required fields comprises at least one of a transaction identifier, a step identifier, and a time stamp. (see Boothby, Col. 21 lines 42-47) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 2, applies equally as well to claim 10.

8. For claim 11, Provinse-Boothby teaches, the method of claim 10, wherein step identifier is a unique identifier associated with a step of the transaction. (see Boothby, Col. 18 lines 31-51) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 2, applies equally as well to claim 11.

9. For claim 12, Provinse-Boothby teaches, the method of claim 10, wherein the time stamp indicates a time at which the step started. (see Boothby, Col. 19 lines 34-44)

The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 2, applies equally as well to claim 12.

10. For claim 13, Provinse-Boothby teaches, the method of claim 1, wherein the information comprises at least one of a transaction type, a transaction origin, and a transaction destination;

the transaction type, the transaction origin and the transaction destination identifying the transaction record. (see Boothby, Col. 8 lines 8-27, Col. 8 lines 33-41)

The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 2, applies equally as well to claim 13.

11. For claim 14, Provinse-Boothby teaches, the method of claim 13, wherein the transaction type describes the type of transaction. (see Boothby, Col. 8 lines 8-27, Col. 8 lines 33-41) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 2, applies equally as well to claim 14.

12. For claim 23, Provinse-Boothby teaches, the computer-readable medium of claim 21, wherein the one or more required fields comprises at least one of a transaction identifier, a step identifier, and a time stamp. (see Boothby, Col. 21 lines 42-47) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 2, applies equally as well to claim 23.

13. Claims 3-6, 9, 22, 26, 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Provinse (U.S. Patent Application 2002/0026416) in view of Sass (U.S. Patent 5,966,717).

14. For claim 3, Provinse fails to clearly disclose, the method of claim 1, wherein determining whether the new log entry comprises the one or more required fields comprises determining whether the new log entry comprises the one or more required fields using a set of mapping rules providing the format and the location of the information in the new log entry.

Sass teaches, wherein determining whether the new log entry comprises the one or more required fields comprises determining whether the new log entry comprises the one or more required fields using a set of mapping rules providing the format and the location of the information in the new log entry. (see Sass, abstract, Col. 3 lines 35-67, Col. 4 lines 4-12)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the system of Provinse of integrating entries with that of Sass method of mapping entry when integrating since both are analogous art of integrating database entries

15. For claim 4, Provinse-Sass teaches, the method of claim 1, wherein the information is extracted from the new log entry using a set of mapping rules providing the format and the location of the information in the new log entry.

(see Sass, abstract, Col. 5 lines 1-10) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 3, applies equally as well to claim 4.

16. For claim 5, Provinse-Sass teaches, the method of claim 1, further comprising determining whether the plurality of transaction records meets an undesirable condition; and

executing an action responsive to the undesirable condition if the plurality of transactions meets the condition. (see Sass, abstract, Col. 9 line 40 Col. 10 line 13) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 3, applies equally as well to claim 5.

17. For claim 6, Provinse-Sass teaches, the method of claim 5, wherein the condition is whether a number of the plurality of transaction records indicative of active transactions exceeds a predefined numerical limit. (see Sass, abstract, Col. 9 line 40 Col. 10 line 13) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 3, applies equally as well to claim 6

18. For claim 9, Provinse-Sass teaches, the method of claim 5, wherein the action comprises executing a computer program for resolving the condition. (see Sass,

abstract, Col. 9 line 40 Col. 10 line 13) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 3, applies equally as well to claim 9

19. For claim 22, Provinse-Sass teaches, the computer-readable medium of claim 21, further comprising:

determining whether the plurality of transaction records meets a condition; and
executing an action if the plurality of transactions meets the condition. (see Sass, abstract, Col. 3 lines 35-67, Col. 4 lines 4-12) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 3, applies equally as well to claim 22

20. For claim 26, Provinse-Sass teaches, the computer-readable medium of claim 22, wherein the condition is whether a number of the plurality of transaction records indicative of active transactions exceeds a predefined limit. (see Sass, abstract, Col. 9 line 40 Col. 10 line 13) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 3, applies equally as well to claim 26

21. For claim 30, Provinse-Sass teaches, the computer of claim 29, further comprising:

determining whether the plurality of transaction records meets a condition; and
executing an action if the plurality of transactions meets the condition. (see Sass, abstract, Col. 3 lines 35-67, Col. 4 lines 4-12) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 3, applies equally as well to claim 30

22. Claims 17-20, 24, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Provinse (U.S. Patent Application 2002/0026416) in view of Holenstein et al. (U.S. Patent 2002/0026416 referred to as Holenstein).

23. For claim 17, Provinse fails to clearly disclose, the method of claim 1, wherein storing the information comprises storing the information to the database as one of a transaction record and a step record, the transaction record being defined by one or more step records.

Holenstein teaches, the method of claim 1, wherein storing the information comprises storing the information to the database as one of a transaction record and a step record, the transaction record being defined by one or more step records. (see Holenstein, Col. 2 lines 33-63, figure 3)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the system of Provinse of integrating entries with that of Holenstein's method of define entries with steps since both are analogous art of integrating database entries

24. For claim 18, Provinse-Holenstein teaches, the method of claim 17, wherein the information comprises at least one of a step type and a step location, the step type and

the step location identifying the step record. (see Holenstein, Col. Col. 2 lines 33-63, figure 3) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 17, applies equally as well to claim 18.

25. For claim 19, Provinse-Holenstein teaches, the method of claim 18, wherein the step type describes the operation performed by one of the two or more applications at the time the new log entry is recorded. (see Holenstein, Col. Col. 2 lines 33-63, figure 3) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 17, applies equally as well to claim 19.

26. For claim 20, Provinse-Holenstein teaches, the method of claim 18, wherein the step location describes a computer of at least one of the two or more applications. (see Holenstein, Col. Col. 2 lines 33-63, figure 3) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 17, applies equally as well to claim 20.

27. For claim 24, Provinse-Holenstein teaches, the computer-readable medium of claim 21, wherein creating the database comprising a plurality of transaction records from the information comprises storing the information to the database as one of a transaction record and a step record, the transaction record being defined by one or more step records. (see Holenstein, Col. Col. 2 lines 33-63, figure 3) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 17, applies equally as well to claim 24.

28. For claim 25, Provinse-Holenstein teaches, the computer-readable medium of claim 21, wherein the information is extracted from the new log entry using the set of mapping rules providing the format and the location of the information in the new log entry. (see Holenstein, Col. Col. 2 lines 33-63, figure 3) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 17, applies equally as well to claim 25.

29. Claims 7, 8, 27, and 28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Provinse-Sass as applied to claims 3-6, 9, 22, 26, 30 above, and further in view of Boothby (U.S. Patent 5,943,676).

30. For claim 7, Provinse-Sass fails to clearly disclose, the method of claim 5, wherein the condition is whether any of the plurality of transaction records indicative of active transactions has a time duration exceeding a predefined time limit.

Boothby teaches, the method of claim 5, wherein the condition is whether any of the plurality of transaction records indicative of active transactions has a time duration exceeding a predefined time limit. (see Boothby, Col. 13 lines 12-23)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the system of Provinse-Sass of integrating entries with that of Boothby method of integrating and notifying entries since both are analogous art of integrating database entries

31. For claim 8, Provinse-Sass-Boothby teaches, the method of claim 5, wherein executing the action comprises sending a notification message alerting the condition. (see Boothby, Col. 16 lines 43-65) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 7, applies equally as well to claim 8.

32. For claim 27, Provinse-Sass-Boothby teaches, the computer-readable medium of claim 22, wherein the condition is whether any of the plurality of transaction records indicative of active transactions has a time duration exceeding a predefined time limit (see Boothby, Col. 13 lines 12-23) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 7, applies equally as well to claim 27.

33. For claim 28, Provinse-Sass-Boothby teaches, the computer-readable medium of claim 22, wherein executing the action comprises sending a notification message alerting the condition. (see Boothby, Col. 16 lines 43-65) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 7, applies equally as well to claim 28.

34. Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Provinse-Boothby as applied to claims 2, 10-14, and 23 above, and further in view of Holenstein et al. (U.S. Patent 2002/0026416 referred to as Holenstein).

35. For claim 15, Provinse-Boothby fails to clearly disclose, the method of claim 13, wherein the transaction origin describes an entity that originated the transaction.

36. Holenstein teaches, the method of claim 13, wherein the transaction origin describes an entity that originated the transaction. (see Holenstein, Col. 2 lines 33-63, figure 3)

37. For claim 16, Provinse-Boothby-Holenstein teaches, the method of claim 13, wherein the transaction destination describes a final destination of the transaction. (see Holenstein, Col. 2 lines 33-63, figure 3) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 15, applies equally as well to claim 16.

38. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the system of Provinse-Boothby of integrating entries with that of Holenstein method of integrating entries since both are analogous art of integrating database entries

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ajay M Bhatia whose telephone number is (571)-272-3906. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Valencia M Wallace can be reached on (571)-272-6159. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2145

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AB



PATRICE WINDER
PRIMARY EXAMINER